R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 949 48

A SURVEY OF LANGUAGE SCHOOLS NOT UNDER ACADEMIC AUSPICES.

BY- MUSTARD, HELEN M.
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-1-12 PUB DATE NOV 61
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-8342
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.04 26P. REPRINT FROM REPORTS OF SURVEYS AND STUDIES IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, NOV. 1961

DESCRIPTORS- *PRIVATE SCHOOLS, *MODERN LANGUAGES, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *STUDENT ENROLLMENT, SCHOOL SIZE, NATIONAL SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, *TEACHING METHODS, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

A SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED OF 93 SCHOOLS WHICH OFFERED FOREIGN-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN 10 MAJOR CITIES. THESE SCHOOLS WERE SELF-SUPPORTING AND NOT INCLUDED IN SUCH ACADEMIC CATEGORIES AS COLLEGES, PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, AND PRIVATE PREPARATORY SCHOOLS. INFORMATION ON THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES FOREIGN TO AMERICANS WERE GATHERED BY INTERVIEWS WITH EACH SCHOOL, AND THE INVESTIGATION WAS CONCERNED WITH ENROLLMENTS, CLASS SIZE, METHODS OF INSTRUCTION, AUDIOLINGUAL AIDS, AGE AND TYPES OF STUDENTS, AND SCHOOL AND TEACHING STAFF. THE FINDINGS INDICATED THAT--(1) ENROLLMENT HAD INCREASED BETWEEN 1955 AND 1960, (2) SPANISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, RUSSIAN, AND ITALIAN WERE THE MAIN LANGUAGES TAUGHT, AND (3) EASTERN STATES ENROLLMENT WAS LARGER THAN THE COMBINED ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOLS FROM OTHER REGIONS. (RS)

ED003949

PRECEDING PAGE(S) MISSING

1-12
SAE 8342

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

A Survey of Language Schools Not Under Academic Auspices

HELEN M. MUSTARD

Reprinted from
REPORTS OF SURVEYS AND STUDIES
IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
PUBLISHED BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
NOVEMBER 1961

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A Survey of Language Schools Not Under Academic Auspices*

By Helen M. Mustard

PREFACE

I should like to express my warmest appreciation and gratitude to my co-workers in this enterprise, the interviewers for the various cities, many of whom sent me extensive comments and reports in addition to the information called for on the questionnaire. It was their willingness to spend hours searching out these schools and conducting personal interviews which has made possible the results reported here.

The list of cities and interviewers is as follows: Boston: Prof. Herbert H. Golden, Boston University; Chicago: Prof. Agatha Cavallo, Wright Junior College; Cleveland: Prof. Ruth Mulhauser, Western Reserve University; Detroit: Prof. George P. Borglum, Wayne State University; Los Angeles: Prof. John F. Englekirk, University of California; New Orleans: Prof. William J. Smither, Tulane University; New York City: Mrs. Ellin Feld, Columbia University; San Francisco: Prof. Cecilia Ross, University of California, Berkeley; Seattle: Prof. Lurline V. Simpson, University of Washington; Washington, D.C.: Prof. George E. McSpadden, George Washington University.

Helen M. Mustard
Columbia University

May 1961

SUMMARY

1. This survey covers a total of 93 self-supporting schools located in 10 major cities and offering foreign-language instruction to the general public. In the 48 schools giving enrollment figures for 1955, the total enrollment in all languages was 15,050; in the 81 schools giving enrollment figures for 1960, the total enrollment was 20,691. New York led in total enrollment in both 1955 and 1960, with Washington second, and Boston third, and the enrollment in these three cities exceeded for both years that of all the other seven cities.

2. The largest percentage of increase in enrollment between 1955 and 1960 was in Russian.

3. The largest enrollments for both 1955 and 1960 were in the five main languages. In 1960 Spanish was first, French second, German third, Russian fourth, and Italian fifth. Many of the rarer languages are also being taught, 47 in 1960, but actual enrollment figures were difficult to obtain.

4. There seems to have been a general, though not a startling, increase in the study of most of these languages between 1955 and 1960, and 20 new schools have been established since 1955.

5. Contrary to the general impression, language instruction in about 50% or more of these schools is done in groups rather than by private instruction.

6. Methods of instruction seem to be conventional, on the whole, including some conversation, but also grammar, reading, and use of textbooks. Only a few schools stressed that they use the functional approach to grammar.

7. Only 8 schools have language laboratories; 41 use discs or magnetic tapes or both; 26 use no audio-lingual aids.

8. These schools are chiefly institutions for adult education, since the age range from 21 to 50 makes up the greater part of the enrollment. The chief categories of students, in the order of their frequency, are business people, prospective tourists, housewives, college students, and people intending to work abroad.

9. By far the largest number of schools employ only native speakers as teachers. The number of part-time teachers is much larger than the number of full-time staff.

From one city only was there a complaint of a scarcity of competent teachers. This may mean that in spite of some increase in enrollment in these schools between 1955 and 1960, the increase in demand for FL instructors is coming from academic institutions rather than from non-academic ones. Another possible interpretation might be that the non-academic schools are willing to employ native speakers who would not have the necessary academic qualifications to teach in academic institutions.

The number of non-academic schools in regions other than the East is surprisingly small, and some reports from interviewers in those cities were very pessimistic about the present state of FL instruction in such schools and about their prospects for the future.

* The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose of survey: The purpose of this survey was to obtain as much information as possible from schools in various cities in various parts of the country about foreign languages taught in schools not under academic auspices, that is, in schools not included in the usual academic categories such as colleges, public high schools, and private preparatory schools. Such information will, it is hoped, be a useful supplement to information already available about foreign languages taught in academic institutions, and it may help to provide a clearer picture of the status of foreign-language teaching in the country as a whole.

The information requested from the schools concerned: a) enrollments in the various languages in the fall of 1955 and the fall of 1960; b) enrollments by level of instruction in the fall of 1960; c) enrollments by type of instruction, whether private or group, in the fall of 1960; d) the size of the class in group instruction, length of class, frequency of meetings, and the number of weeks that the course is offered; e) methods of instruction; f) use of audio-lingual aids; g) age of students; h) types of students; i) nature of the teaching staff; j) the year in which the school was established.

2. Coverage and method of investigation: This report is based on information obtained by interviews at ninety-three schools in ten major cities, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York, San Francisco, Seattle and Washington, D.C. Only information on the study of languages foreign to Americans is included; any information reported on English for foreigners was excluded.

Of the 93 schools covered, 15 are located in Boston, 9 in Chicago, 2 in Cleveland, 12 in Detroit, 7 in Los Angeles, 2 in New Orleans, 29 in New York, 5 in San Francisco, 5 in Seattle, and 7 in Washington, D.C. More than half of the schools are located in the East, 51 of the total of 93. They include a variety of types of schools: very small "one-man schools"; others slightly larger, consisting of one director assisted by one or two part-time instructors; medium-sized schools with two or three full-time teachers and a few part-time teachers; very large institutions with large faculties, both full and part-time; business schools which offer foreign-language instruction in addition to business courses such as typing and shorthand; various types of schools for adults which offer courses in foreign languages as well as in other subjects, but not for academic credit.

3. Limitations of survey: Perhaps the most serious limitation in this survey is the unreliability of the enrollment figures, whether for total enrollments, enrollments in specific languages, enrollments on various levels of instruction, or enrollments in private or group instruction. Most of the interviewers reported either that their informants

frankly admitted that they could give only an estimate of enrollment figures or that they sensed that the figures given must be only estimates since the informants referred to no records while giving the figures. A number of schools gave figures or estimates of total enrollment, but could give no figures or only partial figures for enrollments in specific languages. In New York only one school produced written records for enrollments. One school informed the interviewer that no records of actual student enrollment were kept; the only records kept were the number of instruction hours for which the particular student was to be charged; hence it would have meant a great expenditure of time to try to ascertain the exact number of students enrolled. Another school said figures were inaccurate due to drop-outs, which could not be recognized as such immediately, and also that figures for one season of the year, e.g., for the fall of 1960, were not necessarily characteristic for the entire year, since the business is a seasonal one. Still another school said that figures for the number of students from the Armed Forces who were studying the unusual languages under government contract were confidential.

On the whole, the schools were very cooperative with the interviewers, but a considerable number, even though sympathetic with the aims of the survey, refused to give any figures at all for enrollments, and some even refused to reveal figures on the size of the faculty or to answer certain other questions. A few schools were willing to give approximate percentages of enrollment in the various languages, but since they gave no figures for total enrollment, these parts of the interviews were of course unusable for statistical tables.

Another limitation, though perhaps not a serious one, is that since a sizeable number of schools were either extremely reluctant to be identified by name or expressly stipulated that they should not be named in the report, the interviewers gave absolute assurance that no school would be identified in this survey. Every effort has therefore been made here to conceal the identity of the individual schools.

4. General remarks on statistical procedure: When schools gave figures, we used them, of course, even though some of them are not completely dependable. When no figures were given for a certain question or part of a question, or when an answer was otherwise unusable for statistical purposes, the school is included in the item of a particular statistical table as belonging to the group of schools which did not answer that question. Whenever schools gave a range of figures as answer to a question, we arbitrarily took the figure midway between the two extremes for use in the statistical tables. For example, if a school gave as its total enrollment for the fall of 1960 the range of 300 to 400, the figure 350 was used for statistical purposes.

TABLE I. TOTAL ENROLLMENT BY CITIES

City	Fall 1955	Fall 1960	Percentage of Increase or Decrease
Boston	937 (10 schools)	1,424 (15 schools)	+ 51.9
Chicago	1,078 (4 schools)	1,254 (7 schools)	+ 10.2
Cleveland	—	85 (2 schools)	—
Detroit	486 (4 schools)	761 (12 schools)	+ 56.6
Los Angeles	303 (1 school)	383 (3 schools)	+ 26.4
New Orleans	495 (2 schools)	424 (2 schools)	− 14.3
New York	9,292 (16 schools)	13,412 (25 schools)	+ 44.3
San Francisco	128 (4 schools)	140 (4 schools)	+ 9.4
Seattle	50 (1 school)	375 (4 schools)	+650.0
Washington	2,281 (6 schools)	2,433 (7 schools)	+ 6.7
	15,050 (48 schools)	20,691 (81 schools)	+ 37.5

PART I. ENROLLMENTS

A. Enrollment by Cities: The total enrollment for the fall of 1955 in the ten cities covered by this survey, as reported by 48 schools, was 15,050, and the total enrollment for the fall of 1960, as reported by 81 schools, was 20,691. The discrepancy between the number of schools reporting is not as great as it might seem, since 20 of the 93 schools did not exist in the fall of 1955. This means that of the 73 schools in operation in 1955, 25 gave no figures for total enrollment. Nevertheless, there is a discrepancy here, since only 12 schools failed to give enrollment figures for 1960; and since the general unreliability of figures was mentioned above, the percentage of increase in total enrollment, 37.5%, can only be an approximate figure.

New York leads the other cities in total enrollment, with 9292 students in 16 schools in 1955 and 13,412 students in 25 schools in 1960. Washington is second, with 2281 students in 6 schools in 1955 and 2433 students in 7 schools in 1960. Chicago is in third place in 1955, with 1078 students in 4 schools, but in 1960 Boston takes third place, with 1424 students in 15 schools compared with Chicago's 1254 students in 7 schools. The lowest enrollment reported for 1955 is in Seattle with 50 students in one school, and the lowest in 1960 is Cleveland, with 85 in 2 schools.

On the basis of the figures available, the highest percentage of increase in enrollment was in Detroit, 56.6%; the second highest in Boston, 51.9%; and the third highest in New York, 44.3%.[1] The smallest percentage of increase is in San Francisco, 9.4%. The only city showing a decrease is New Orleans, 14.3%. Here again, however, the reader must be warned against taking these percentages as anything but approximate figures. Only the figures for New Orleans and San Francisco seem to give a fairly accurate picture, and the high percentage of increase for Boston and New York should certainly be taken with a large grain of salt, since the interviewers in those cities emphasized the apparent unreliability of the figures.

It is clear that by far the largest enrollments are in the three Eastern cities. In 1955 the enrollment in these cities in 32 schools was 12,510 as compared with 2540 in 16 schools in the other sections of the country. In 1960 the enrollment in the Eastern cities was 17,259 in 47 schools as compared with 3432 in 34 schools in other sections.

B. Enrollment in Languages by Cities: New York had in 1960 by far the largest enrollment in all the main languages except Russian, with 5137 in French, 1021 in German, 1090 in Italian, and 3983 in Spanish. In Russian, Washington was in first place with 218, Boston second with 157, and Detroit third with 70. Except in New York there were no enrollments above 500 in any city in any one language. In the West, except for the enrollments in French, 418 for the three cities, and in Spanish, 269 for the three cities, the enrollments, especially in Russian, were very small.[2] With the exception of Russian enrollment in Detroit, the three Eastern cities have the largest enrollments in all the main languages.

The figures for enrollment in the less usual languages were particularly hard to obtain.[3] On the

[1] The Seattle increase of 650% is based, I fear, on inaccurate data supplied to the interviewer.

[2] For further comments on the status of foreign languages in schools in the West and Middle West, see Part XI.

[3] For further comments on this problem, see Part I C.

basis of the figures available, Washington led the list in 1960, with 272; Boston was second, with 117; and Detroit third, with 83. San Francisco had the lowest enrollment, three students, and New Orleans had no students in these languages.

The largest increases in enrollment between 1955 and 1960 are in Russian. New Orleans had an increase of 1400%, from 1 to 15 students; Detroit an increase of 1300%, from 5 to 70 students; New York an increase of 960%, from 5 to 53 students. Oddly enough, the city with the largest enrollment in Russian in 1960, Washington, had a decrease of 18.3%, from 267 to 218 students.

In French all the cities giving figures for both 1955 and 1960 show an increase in enrollment ranging from 15.2% in New Orleans to 58.9% in New York.[4] In German 4 cities show an increase ranging from 31.1% in New York to 82.5% in Boston; 2 cities show a decrease, in New Orleans, 14.3%, in Los Angeles, 20%. In Italian 5 cities show an increase ranging from 23.9% in New York to 206.9% in Washington; one city, New Orleans, has a decrease of 28.6%. In Russian 5 cities show an increase ranging from 166.7% in Los Angeles to 1400% in New Orleans. In Spanish 5 cities show an increase ranging from 0.9% in San Francisco to 70% in Los Angeles; 2 show a decrease, in Washington, 3.3%, in New Orleans, 23.8%.

In the less usual languages 4 cities show an increase in enrollment ranging from 16.7% in New York to 336.7% in Detroit; 2 show a decrease, in Boston, 12.7%, in Los Angeles, 65%.[5]

Dashes are used in Table II when no figures are given for enrollment in a language, either in 1955 or in 1960. These dashes seem to mean in most cases that the figure was not available, but on only a small number of the reports is the distinction made clear as to whether there was no figure available or no enrollment in that language for that particular year. Since it was therefore impossible to make a distinction between the two possibilities, the dash is used for both.

C. Total Enrollment by Languages: Enrollments in the main languages are larger by far, both in 1955 and in 1960, than the enrollment in any of the less common languages, but since the figures for these languages are discussed later in detail, no further comments on them will be made here.

In 1955, 28 of the less common languages were

[4] Again I am excluding the figures from Seattle.

[5] The same comments on the general validity of figures and percentages as were made in connection with Table I apply here, hence no further comment.

[6] For details as to the number of schools offering other languages and size of enrollments, see Table III.

TABLE II. ENROLLMENT IN LANGUAGES BY CITIES, FALL 1955 AND FALL 1960

City	Fall 1955	Fall 1960	Percentage of Increase or Decrease
	FRENCH		
Boston	345 (7 schools)	472 (10 schools)	+ 36.9
Chicago	—	63 (3 schools)	—
Cleveland	—	20 (2 schools)	—
Detroit	177 (2 schools)	222 (4 schools)	+ 25.4
Los Angeles	150 (1 school)	200 (1 school)	+ 33.3
New Orleans	79 (2 schools)	91 (2 schools)	+ 15.2
New York	3,230 (12 schools)	5,137 (17 schools)	+ 58.9
San Francisco	25 (1 school)	35 (1 school)	+ 40.0
Seattle	50 (1 school)	183 (4 schools)	+125.9
Washington	400 (5 schools)	532 (7 schools)	+ 33.0
	GERMAN		
Boston	86 (3 schools)	157 (6 schools)	+ 82.5
Chicago	—	6 (1 school)	—
Cleveland	—	13 (2 schools)	—
Detroit	76 (3 schools)	117 (4 schools)	+ 54.0
Los Angeles	20 (1 school)	16 (1 school)	− 20.0
New Orleans	35 (1 school)	30 (1 school)	− 14.3
New York	832 (5 schools)	1,021 (9 schools)	+ 31.1
San Francisco	—	—	—
Seattle	—	25 (2 schools)	—
Washington	168 (5 schools)	231 (6 schools)	+ 37.5
	ITALIAN		
Boston	150 (4 schools)	240 (7 schools)	+ 60.0
Chicago	—	13 (1 school)	—
Cleveland	—	2 (1 school)	—
Detroit	30 (1 school)	48 (1 school)	+ 60.0
Los Angeles	40 (1 school)	60 (1 school)	+ 50.0
New Orleans	35 (1 school)	25 (1 school)	− 28.6
New York	880 (6 schools)	1,090 (8 schools)	+ 23.9
San Francisco	—	—	—
Seattle	—	12 (1 school)	—
Washington	43 (2 schools)	132 (4 schools)	+206.9
	RUSSIAN		
Boston	30 (2 schools)	147 (6 schools)	+390.0
Chicago	—	7 (2 schools)	—
Cleveland	—	12 (2 schools)	—
Detroit	5 (1 school)	70 (5 schools)	+1300.0
Los Angeles	3 (1 school)	8 (1 school)	+166.7
New Orleans	1 (1 school)	15 (2 schools)	+1400.0
New York	5 (2 schools)	53 (6 schools)	+960.0
San Francisco	—	—	—
Seattle	—	8 (1 school)	—
Washington	267 (4 schools)	218 (4 schools)	− 18.3
	SPANISH		
Boston	192 (6 schools)	291 (10 schools)	+ 51.5
Chicago	—	98 (4 schools)	—
Cleveland	—	33 (2 schools)	—
Detroit	179 (4 schools)	221 (5 schools)	+ 23.5
Los Angeles	50 (1 school)	85 (1 school)	+ 70.0
New Orleans	345 (2 schools)	263 (2 schools)	− 23.8
New York	3,121 (14 schools)	3,983 (19 schools)	+ 27.6
San Francisco	101 (4 schools)	102 (5 schools)	+ 0.9
Seattle	—	82 (2 schools)	—
Washington	509 (6 schools)	492 (7 schools)	− 3.3
	OTHER LANGUAGES[6]		
Boston	134	117	− 12.7
Chicago	—	7	—
Cleveland	—	5	—
Detroit	19	83	+336.7
Los Angeles	40	14	− 65.0
New Orleans	—	—	—
New York	24	28	+ 16.7
San Francisco	2	3	+ 50.0
Seattle	—	23	—
Washington	224	272	+ 21.4

taught in one or more schools. For 21 of these languages some enrollment figures were available, for 7 none. In 1960, 19 more of the rarer languages were being taught, making a total of 47, but enrollment figures were available for only 8 of these 19.

It is obvious that this report does not give a complete picture of enrollments in the less usual languages. The large number of schools giving no enrollment figures would seem to confirm this impression (Table III). In 1960, for instance, enrollment figures were given for only 6 languages by all schools teaching these languages; in 4 languages the number of schools giving no enrollment figures was larger than the number giving figures; in 13 languages the number of schools giving no figures was either the same or only slightly less than the number giving figures; for 17 languages no enrollment figures at all were available.

Doubtless many students of these languages are now being trained at colleges and universities or at such institutions as the Georgetown Institute, none of which come within the sphere of this survey, but one would expect the enrollments for many of these languages to be higher than they appear in Table III, even in such non-academic schools. It is possible that the chief reason for the incomplete enrollment figures or total lack of them may lie in the statements from schools under government contract to train students in the so-called "exotic" languages that such enrollment figures cannot be disclosed.

In 1960, according to the partial figures available to us, Modern Hebrew has the highest enrollment with 118 students; Chinese and Portuguese are second, with 72 students in each; Arabic is third with 49 students. Enrollments in the other rare languages are all small, ranging from one student in some languages to 38 in Japanese.

Most of the rare languages for which enrollment figures were available show an increase between 1955 and 1960. Eighteen in all show an increase, ranging from 1.4% in Chinese to 600% in Tagalog. Four languages show a decrease, ranging from 4% in Portuguese to 25% in Korean.

D. Range of Enrollments in Main Languages by Schools, Fall 1955 and Fall 1960: Spanish was offered by the largest number of schools, 62 in 1955 and 71 in 1960. French is in second place, 57 schools in 1955 and 61 in 1960. German comes third, 39 schools in 1955 and 46 in 1960. In 1955 Italian was in fourth place, with 34 schools, and Russian in fifth place, with 28 schools. In 1960 this sequence was reversed, with Russian in 45 schools, and Italian with 38 schools.

TABLE III. TOTAL ENROLLMENT BY LANGUAGES, FALL 1955 AND FALL 1960

Language	Fall 1955		Fall 1960		Percentage of Increase or Decrease	No. of Schools Giving No Figures	
	Students	Schools	Students	Schools		Fall 1955	Fall 1960
Amharic	0		2	1	—		
Amoy	0		1	1	—		
Arabic	45	7	49	10	+ 6.5	7	7
Chinese	71	5	72	7	+ 1.4	7	7
Czech	4	1	5	2	+ 25.0	3	4
Danish	21	3	25	9	+ 19.0	9	6
Dutch	13	4	21	7	+ 61.5	8	7
Farsi	2	1	4	1	+100.0		
Finnish	11	3	10	2	— 9.1	3	3
French	4,456	57	6,955	61	+ 56.1		
German	1,217	39	1,616	46	+ 32.8		
Greek (Modern)	23	5	21	7	— 8.7	8	7
Hebrew (Modern)	88	4	118	9	+ 34.1	7	7
Hindi	12	2	13	3	+ 8.4	4	4
Indonesian	N.D.		3	1	—	1	1
Iraqui	0		2	1	—		
Italian	1,178	34	1,622	38	+ 37.7		
Japanese	18	4	38	11	+111.1	12	9
Korean	8	3	6	3	− 25.0	4	3
Laotian	0		1	1	—		
Norwegian	12	3	12	4	—	9	7
Pashto	0		1	1	—		
Polish	14	4	23	5	+ 64.3	5	4
Portuguese	75	12	72	14	− 4.0	15	10
Russian	311	28	538	45	+ 72.9		
Serbian	1	1	5	1	+400.0		
Spanish	4,497	62	5,650	71	+ 25.7		
Swahili	1	1	N.D.		—	1	2
Swedish	18	3	29	8	+ 61.1	7	7
Tagalog	1	1	7	2	+600.0		
Thai	0		5	2	—		
Turkish	4	2	4	2	—		1
Twi	0		1	1	—		
Viet	0		2	1	—		

Other languages taught in the fall of 1955, but for which no enrollment figures were given, were Brazilian Portuguese, Gaelic, Hungarian, Israeli, Mali, and Serbo-Croatian.

Other languages taught in the fall of 1960, but for which no enrollment figures were given, were Afrikaans, Armenian, Bengali, Efik, Esperanto, Gaelic, Hausa, Hungarian, Irish, Israeli, Latvian, Lithuanian, Malay, Mali, Persian, and Serbo-Croatian.

In proportion to the total number of schools giving enrollment figures, the number of schools with less than 10 students in any one language is very large, both in 1955 and in 1960. In French in 1955 there were 5 such schools out of the total of 32 giving figures; in 1960 there were 6 out of 48. In German in 1955 there were 4 out of 18; in 1960 there were 11 out of 33. In Italian in 1955 there were 4 out of 15; in 1960 there were 8 out of 27. In Russian in 1955 there were 8 out of 12; in 1960 there were 16 out of 29. In Spanish in 1955 there were 6 out of 37; in 1960 there were 10 out of 57.

The majority of schools giving figures had no more than 50 students in any one of the main languages. In French 18 out of 32 schools had at most 50 students in 1955; in 1960, 29 out of 48 schools. In German 15 out of 18 schools had at most 50 students in 1955; in 1960, 27 out of 33 schools. In Italian 12 out of 15 schools had no more than 50 students; in 1960, 21 out of 27 schools. In Russian 11 out of 12 schools had less than 50 students in 1955; in 1960, 27 out of 29 schools. In Spanish 22 out of 37 schools had no more than 50 students in 1955; in 1960, 42 out of 57 schools.

The number of schools with enrollments of more than 100 in German, Italian, or Russian, in either

TABLE IV. RANGE OF ENROLLMENTS IN MAIN LANGUAGES BY SCHOOLS, FALL 1955 AND FALL 1960

No. of Students	No. of Schools Fall 1955	No. of Schools Fall 1960
FRENCH		
Below 10	5	6
10–25	6	13
26–50	7	10
51–100	7	10
101–150	3	3
151–200	0	1
201–300	2	1
301–400[7]	1	2
1001–2000	0	1
2001–3000	1	1
No figures given	25	13
Total number of schools offering French	57	61

Range of enrollments: Fall 1955, 1–2250; Fall 1960, 4–2700 students.

GERMAN		
Below 10	4	11
10–25	5	12
26–50	6	4
51–100	1	4
101–150	1	0
151–200[7]	0	1
501–1000	1	1
No figures given	21	13
Total number of schools offering German	39	46

Range of enrollments: Fall 1955, 1–750 students; Fall 1960, 1–900 students.

ITALIAN		
Below 10	4	8
10–25	3	10
26–50	5	3
51–100	1	4
101–150[7]	1	1
501–1000	1	1
No figures given	19	11
Total number of schools offering Italian	34	38

Range of enrollments: Fall 1955, 5–750 students; Fall 1960, 1–900 students.

RUSSIAN		
Below 10	8	16
10–25	2	7
26–50	1	4
51–100[7]	0	1
151–200	0	1
201–300	1	0
No figures given	16	16
Total number of schools offering Russian	28	45

Range of enrollments: Fall 1955, 1–210 students; Fall 1960, 1–180 students.

SPANISH		
Below 10	6	10
10–25	9	16
26–50	7	16
51–100	8	3
101–150	2	7
151–200	2	2
201–300[7]	2	2
2001–3000	1	1
No figures given	25	14
Total number of schools offering Spanish	62	71

Range of enrollments: Fall 1955, 2–2250 students; Fall 1960, 5–2700 students.

1955 or 1960 is exceedingly small. Only Spanish and French have a sizeable number of such schools. In Spanish in 1955 there were 7 schools with more than 100 students; in 1960 there were 12. In French in 1955 there were 7 schools with more than 100 students; in 1960 there were 9. Unusually large enrollments (over 500) in any one language are not found in more than one school in the country.

Only 2 schools reported enrollments of over 50 students in any of the uncommon languages. In both 1955 and 1960 one school reported an enrollment of between 51 and 100 in Chinese, and another school reported an enrollment in the same range in Modern Hebrew. Average enrollments in such languages seem to be much smaller. In 1955 enrollments below 10 students were reported by 57 schools[8] for one or more of the following languages: Arabic, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Farsi, Finnish, Modern Greek, Modern Hebrew, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Serbian, Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog, and Turkish. In 1955 enrollments of from 10 to 25 students were reported by 10 schools[8] for one or more of the following languages: Arabic, Danish, Hindi, Polish, Portuguese, and Swedish. In 1960 enrollments below 10 students were reported by 94 schools[8] for one or more of the following languages: Amharic, Amoy, Arabic, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Farsi, Finnish, Modern Greek, Modern Hebrew, Hindi, Indonesian, Iraqui, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Norwegian, Pashto, Polish, Portuguese, Serbian, Swedish, Tagalog, Thai, Turkish, Twi, and Viet. In 1960 enrollments of from 10 to 25 students were reported by 10 schools[8] for one or more of the following languages: Arabic, Danish, Hindi, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, and Swedish.

E. Percentage of Increase or Decrease in Main Languages by Schools, Fall 1955 and Fall 1960: a. *Statistical procedure.* This part of the survey examines only those schools which gave enrollment figures for the main languages for both 1955 and 1960. In figuring percentage of increase or decrease only those schools were used which showed a difference in enrollment between the two years, and the number of schools having the same enrollment in both years were not included (Table V-A). In figuring overall percentage of increase or decrease in all schools giving enrollment figures for 1955 and 1960, we also excluded those schools which had the same enrollment in both years (Table V-B).

b. *Comparison of schools showing increase with those showing decrease.* This comparison is not intended to give a picture of the amount of increase or decrease in total enrollment in the ten cities covered.[9] In Spanish 23 schools showed an average increase of 25.1% compared with 9 schools with an average decrease of 38.8%, while 4 schools had the same enrollment in both years. In French 19 schools showed an increase of 27.4%, compared with 5 schools with a decrease of 6.3%, while 7 schools had the same enrollment. In Italian 9 schools showed an increase of 29%, compared with 3 with a decrease of 34.6%, while 3 schools had the same enrollment. In German 8 schools showed an increase of 30.7%, compared with 6 with a decrease of 25.5%, while 3 schools had the same enrollment. In Russian 4 schools (with very small enrollments) showed an increase of 166.7%, compared with 4 with a decrease of 20.5%, while 3 had the same enrollment.

c. *Percentage of increase or decrease in all schools with change in enrollment between 1955 and 1960* (Table V-B). In spite of the number of schools showing decreases, this same group of schools, when viewed as one group, shows increases in all the languages except Russian. Italian has the largest increase, 21.9%; German the second largest, 21.2%; French is third with 19.7%; and Spanish fourth with 14.3%. Russian shows a decrease of 13.9%.[10]

[7] A break in the sequence of figures in the column *Number of students* means that no reporting school had enrollments in that range.

[8] This number is larger than the actual number of schools offering these languages, since some schools offer more than one of the unusual languages. For detailed figures as to the number of schools offering each language, see Table III.

[9] For these figures see Table III, which gives total figures and total percentages of increase or decrease.

[10] It should be emphasized that the percentages in Table V are not representative for the total number of schools

TABLE V. PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE OR DECREASE IN MAIN LANGUAGES BY SCHOOLS, FALL 1955 AND FALL 1960

Part A

Schools Showing Increase

Language	No. of Schools	No. of Students 1955	No. of Students 1960	Average Increase	Range of Increase
French	19	3233	4125	27.4%	2.6%–500%
German	8	960	1255	30.7%	20%–400%
Italian	9	1003	1294	29.0%	20%–171.5%
Russian	4	9	24	166.7%	75%–600%
Spanish	23	3569	4466	25.1%	2.5%–200%

Schools Showing Decrease

Language	No. of Schools	No. of Students 1955	No. of Students 1960	Average Decrease	Range of Decrease
French	5	590	453	6.3%	11.9%–41.2%
German	6	196	146	25.5%	5.3%–65.1%
Italian	3	127	83	34.6%	28.6%–37.7%
Russian	4	249	198	20.5%	14.3%–60%
Spanish	9	729	446	38.8%	12.5%–81.5%

Schools Showing Same Enrollment

Language	No. of Schools	No. of Students
French	7	628
German	3	48
Italian	3	48
Russian	3	37
Spanish	4	186

Part B

Language	No. of Schools with Increase or Decrease Fall 1955	No. of Students Fall 1955	No. of Students Fall 1960	Percentage of Increase or Decrease
French	24	3823	4578	19.7%
German	14	1156	1401	21.2%
Italian	12	1130	1377	21.9%
Russian	8	258	222	−13.9%
Spanish	32	4298	4912	14.3%

d. *Geographical distribution of schools showing increase or decrease or no change in enrollment.* Of the 26 schools offering French which show an increase or no change in enrollment, 20 are in the East; of the 5 schools with a decrease, 3 are in the East. In German, of the 11 schools with increase or no change, 9 are in the East; of the 6 schools with decrease, 3 are in the East. In Italian, of the 12 schools with increase or no change, 10 are in the East; of the 3 schools with decrease, 2 are in the East. In Russian, of the 7 schools with increase or no change, 5 are in the East; of the 4 schools with decrease, 3 are in the East. In Spanish, of the 27 schools with increase or no change, 20 are in the East; of the 9 schools with decrease, 6 are in the East. From these figures it is clear that by far the largest number of schools with an increase in enrollment or no change are in the Eastern cities; the same is actually true of the proportion of schools showing a decrease, but the number of such schools is so much smaller that it does not seem very significant.

covered in the survey; they are of interest only in connection with this limited comparison of schools showing increase with those showing decrease in enrollment. A comparison of the percentages in Table V with those in Table III, which gives the percentage of increase or decrease in total enrollment in all languages between 1955 and 1960, will show the great disparity. One reason for this disparity is that for Table V a considerable number of schools was excluded. Some schools had students in a certain language in 1955, but no students in that language in 1960. Some schools were able to give enrollment figures for 1960, but not for 1955, even though there was an enrollment for both years. Schools established after 1955 could of course give no figures for 1955. All these schools and their enrollment figures were excluded in Table V, but were included in Table III.

PART II. ENROLLMENT BY LEVEL, ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE, ADVANCED, FALL 1960

In the schools giving figures about enrollment by level in the main languages, the largest enrollments are on the elementary level. Approximately 50% of the French and Spanish students are on the elementary level; in the other languages (German, Italian, and Russian) approximately two-thirds of the students are on the elementary level. Spanish has the highest percentage on the intermediate level, 35.1%; French is second with 31.2%; Italian and Russian are approximately even, with 22.2% and 21.9% respectively; German has the smallest percentage on this level, 17.7%. French has the largest enrollment on the advanced level, 18.9%; Spanish and German have almost the same percentage, 14.3% and 14.2%; Italian follows with 12.3%; and Russian, as might be expected, has the smallest percentage of advanced students, 10.6%. It would be interesting to compare this relationship among the levels with that among corresponding levels in colleges and universities. My guess, though of course it can be only a guess, is that the relationship would be approximately the same.

It is unfortunate that figures for enrollment by level were provided for less than half the total number of students enrolled in all five main languages. The percentages given above are based on a total number of 6102 students, but for 12,379 other students studying these same languages no figures were given for enrollment by level. For most of these languages, the percentages are based on considerably less than half the number of students enrolled. Only in Russian does the figure on which the percentages are based, 301, exceed the figure for which no breakdown by level was given, 237. In addition, a sizeable number of schools for each language, ranging from 10 to 14, gave no enrollment figures at all. This means that the figures available for statistics are much too small to give an accurate picture.

Similar information in statistical form for the more unusual languages could not be given. Very few schools were able to give us figures for different enrollment levels in each of the unusual languages, and the number of students involved was usually so small that percentages would be almost meaningless. Twelve schools did give figures for

TABLE VI. ENROLLMENTS BY LEVEL, ELEMENTARY, INTERMEDIATE, ADVANCED, IN MAIN LANGUAGES, FALL 1960

Language	No. of Schools	No. of Students	Percentage			No Breakdown Given	No Figures Given
			Elementary	Intermediate	Advanced		
French	36	3102	49.9	31.2	18.9	16 schools—3853 students	14 schools
German	18	359	68.1	17.7	14.2	12 schools—1257 students	12 schools
Italian	16	432	65.5	22.2	12.3	10 schools—1190 students	10 schools
Russian	19	301	67.5	21.9	10.6	10 schools— 237 students	11 schools
Spanish	36	1908	50.6	35.1	14.3	20 schools—3742 students	13 schools
		Total: 6102				Total: 12379	

enrollment by level, but these figures concern only 248 students in all the unusual languages. Eleven schools, with an enrollment of 2104 in such languages, gave no figures for enrollment by level, and 16 schools, though reporting that they taught at least some of these languages, gave no enrollment figures of any kind.

PART III. ENROLLMENT BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION, PRIVATE OR GROUP, FALL 1960

The surprising result of this part of the survey is the large amount of instruction given in groups, and only a very small number of schools, 5 in all (Table VIII), defines a group as a class as small as two or three students. Almost 73% of French instruction is done in groups; Italian is second with 57.6%; Russian third with 50.4%; Spanish fourth with 48.0%; and German last with 44.8%. This means that at least half the instruction in the main languages is group instruction.

The total figure on which these percentages are based is 8795 students in the five languages, as against the total enrollment figure of 7586 for which no breakdown as to the type of instruction was given. The following table of statistics thus represents a larger proportion of the total figure available than was the case with Table VI, though here, too, a considerable number of schools failed to give any total enrollment to work with.

For reasons similar to those given for Table VI no statistics are given in Table VII for the type of instruction given in the rarer languages. Only 19 schools provided the necessary figures, and twelve of these had very small enrollments. Seventeen schools did not provide the necessary information. For the 7 schools with fairly large enrollments in these languages which did give figures, four in Boston and three in Washington, the percentages may be of some interest. In the four schools in Boston with a total of 116 students in the unusual languages, 27.6% of the instruction is private and 72.4% is in groups. In the three schools in Washington with a total of 245 students in less common languages, 44.1% of the instruction is private and 55.9% is in groups.

PART IV. GROUP INSTRUCTION

A. Usual size of class: Of the 76 schools answering this question the two favorite sizes for classes are groups of 4 to 6 or 10 to 15. Twenty-four schools report classes of the former size, and 24 of the latter. Classes over 15 are rare. Only 8 schools report the usual size of the class as between 16 and 30, and only 1 school offers classes of up to 50 students. Of the 76 schools, 67 have groups of 15 or under. Since it was shown in Table VI that the vast majority of students enrolled are on the elementary or intermediate level, this type of school seems to realize, as public schools and many colleges have been slow to realize, that good language teaching can be done only with small groups, if group instruction is to be used at all.

B. Class time in minutes: The most popular length for the class hour is, as in most colleges and universities, 50 to 60 minutes. Thirty-eight out of 78 schools give this as their class period. Sixteen schools have 90-minute periods; 14 have periods of 120 minutes; 4 have 75-minute periods. Other class lengths are represented by only one school each. It is perhaps a little surprising that as many as 14 schools should have class periods as long as 120 minutes, since any language teacher knows how strenuous it is for both students and teachers to do intensive practice in language skills for such a long period. Three schools have even longer periods, 150 minutes, 180 minutes, and 240 minutes.

C. Frequency of class meetings: The answer to this question brought another surprise. Of the total of 86 schools, 44 have only one class meeting a week, and 26 only 2 meetings per week. Surprise is perhaps too mild a term; shock would be better. No matter how long the class period may be, no

TABLE VII. ENROLLMENT BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION, PRIVATE OR GROUP, FALL 1960

Language	No. of Schools	No. of Students	Percentages		No Breakdown Given	No Figures Given
			Private	Group		
French	46	4084	27.1	72.9	6 schools—2871 students	15 schools
German	28	707	55.2	44.8	4 schools— 909 students	14 schools
Italian	23	698	42.4	57.6	4 schools— 924 students	12 schools
Russian	26	530	49.6	50.4	3 schools— 8 students	13 schools
Spanish	50	2776	52.0	48.0	7 schools—2874 students	15 schools
		Total 8795			Total 7586	

TABLE VIII. GROUP INSTRUCTION

A. Usual Size of Class	No. of Schools	*B.* Class Time in Minutes	No. of Schools
2 or 3	5	45	1
4–6	24	50–60	38
7–9	14	75	4
10–15	24	80	1
16–20	3	90	16
21–25	2	110	1
26–30	3	120	14
31–40	0	150	1
up to 50	1	180	1
	—	240	1
Total	76	Total	78

C. Frequency of Class Meetings	No. of Schools	*D.* No. of Weeks Class is Offered	No. of Schools
1 per week	44	4	1
2 per week	26	5–9	6
3 per week	7	10–12	31
4 per week	0	13–15	7
5 per week	4	16–20	6
Indefinite	5	21–25	3
	—	26–30	5
Total	86	Over 30	10
		Indefinite	8
		Total	67

language can be taught adequately, either with private or group instruction, in two meetings or less per week. Seven schools hold three meetings per week, and four have five meetings. Five schools gave as an answer "indefinite," meaning usually that the student himself chooses the number of class meetings per week.

D. Number of weeks class is offered: Almost half of the schools answering this question, 31 out of 67, offer a class from 10 to 12 weeks. The next largest group, 10 schools, offers classes of over 30 weeks. Here the length of time varies greatly and occasionally extends to a year or two. Eight schools, the third largest group, gave as an answer "indefinite," again indicating, as with "C" above, that the student could choose for himself the length of time he wished to pursue his studies. Only one school offers a course as short as four weeks, and only six give courses lasting from 5 to 9 weeks.

The course-offerings of 10 to 12 weeks or of 13 to 15 weeks should not be interpreted as corresponding to, let us say, a one-semester college course in a language. Of the 31 schools offering courses from 10 to 12 weeks, 23 have class meetings only once a week, 6 have 2 class meetings per week, one has 3 class meetings per week, and only one school has 5 class meetings per week. Of the 7 schools offering courses from 13 to 15 weeks, 4 have class meetings only once a week, 2 have class meetings twice a week, and only one has class meetings 3 times a week.

PART V. METHOD OF INSTRUCTION

A. Conversation: The first question we asked was not worded clearly enough. "Is the method of instruction exclusively conversation of a practical nature?" The two interviewers in New York soon discovered that almost no school was willing to define itself in that way, and it became quite clear from the comments written by interviewers in other cities that their experience was similar to ours. Very frequently additional comments made an accurate interpretation of this answer possible: "conversation a part of work" or "not *exclusively* conversation." Very often, however, the answer given was simply "No," and yet it seemed obvious from the nature of the school, answers to other questions, or other comments by the interviewer, that conversation was undoubtedly part of the work. Hence the writer of this report decided to interpret even the "No" answers (except for one from a correspondence school where the "No" obviously meant just that) as meaning that conversation was at least a part of the students' work.

Only two schools in the country reported that their method consisted exclusively of conversation of a practical nature. Eighty-four schools include conversation as part of the work.

B. Grammar: Seventy-five schools stated that grammar forms part of the work, but eight other schools emphasized the fact that grammar was not taught *per se*, but used functionally as the knowledge of certain grammatical principles became necessary.

C. Reading: Eighty-three schools reported that reading is a part of their method. A few schools qualified this answer by saying that if a particular student wanted to read, he was encouraged to do so, but if he preferred not to, reading was not forced upon him.

D. Textbooks: Eighty-four schools regularly use textbooks as part of their method of instruction. Eight of these schools stated that they use their own textbooks, and nine schools stressed the fact that they use their own method of instruction.

E. Additional Remarks: The general picture as it emerges from the interviews is that the methods of instruction in these schools do not differ greatly from the traditional methods used in many academic institutions. The fact that only 8 schools emphasized that the study of grammar was functional rather than systematic confirms the impression of a certain conservatism. Two or three of the interviewers happened to have an opportunity to watch teachers at work in a few of these schools and reported that the methods used were quite conventional. These chance observations may of course not be at all typical of this group of schools as a whole.

TABLE IX. METHOD OF INSTRUCTION

	No. of Schools
Exclusively conversation of a practical nature	2
Conversation a part of work	84
No conversation (correspondence school)	1
Study of grammar	75
Grammar, but not *per se*	8
Instruction includes reading	83
Textbooks used	84
School uses own method	9
School uses own textbooks	8
Question not answered or only partially answered	6

PART VI. AUDIO-LINGUAL AIDS

Twenty-nine schools state that they use one or more of the following audio-lingual aids: language laboratories, discs, or magnetic tapes. If we add to this total the 6 schools which report the use of tape recorders and 2 schools using records,[11] we get a total of 37 schools out of the 89 schools answering this question which use some kind of audio-lingual aids. Of these 37 schools, 19 are in New York or Washington.

TABLE X. AUDIO-LINGUAL AIDS

Audio-Lingual Aids	No. of Schools
Language laboratories	8
Discs	21
Magnetic tapes	20
Total number of schools using one or more of 3 types of aids above	29
Other aids:	
Tape recorders	6
Films	1
Records	4
Schools planning such aids for future	3
Schools using no audio-lingual aids	26
Question not answered	4

Only 8 of 89 schools reported that they have language laboratories. Twenty-one schools use discs, and 20 use magnetic tapes. Six schools use tape recorders for various purposes, for phonetic courses, for student listening and for pronunciation drill, or for special needs of particular students. Four schools use records; one of these uses records to show the students their rate of progress; one school gives records to the students for home study.

One school reports that it uses films to provide theory and oral practice, basic grammar, and vocabulary.

Three schools are planning for some audio-lingual aids in the future.

Seven schools explained in some detail why they are not using such aids. One school stated that with private or semi-private lessons, contact with experienced native teachers makes such aids unnecessary. Four schools went so far as to say that such aids are a waste of time; one added that these aids are merely gadgets, that representatives of the school had observed them in operation at reputable institutions, had tested them, and found them useful merely for diagnostic and corrective purposes. Another school in the same group said that these aids are useful only in their research department. Another school, also in this same group of four, said that such aids had been tried and found superfluous and added that the teachers

[11] Two schools from the total of 4, as given in Table X, are omitted here because they also reported using discs and are therefore included in the total of 29 first mentioned.

did not take kindly to them. One school simply commented, "Machines can never replace men."

PART VII. USUAL AGE OF STUDENTS

A. Statistical procedure: In very few schools, not more than 3 or 4 of the 91 answering this question, is there any one age group which is in the majority. Most of the schools gave from two to five age groups in which the enrollment was about equal, and a considerable number of schools reported about the same enrollment in all six age groups. For the statistics given in Table XI we list in each age range every school which reported that this age group was among their larger groups. Since many schools reported that the majority of their students fell within two or more age groups, such schools are counted more than once in the table. For instance, if a school reported that its largest groups were in the range from age 21 to 30 and from 41 to 50, that school is included in the total number of schools for both these age groups.

TABLE XI. USUAL AGE OF STUDENTS

Age Range	No. of Schools
Under 20	9
21–30	43
31–40	51
41–50	40
51–60	22
Over 60	10
No one age group in majority	28
Question not answered	2

B. Range of age: The age range is very large in almost all schools. The greatest numbers fall between ages 21 and 60, with 62 schools[12] reporting their largest enrollment within this range. In a further breakdown within this large range, 43 schools report large enrollments in the range from age 21 to 30; 51 for the range from 31 to 40; 40 for the range from 41 to 50; and 22 for the range from 51 to 60. The largest group is the range from 41 to 50, and the two groups, ages 21 to 30 and 41 to 50, are reported in about the same number of schools as being the next largest. Only 9 schools reported sizeable enrollments of students under 20, and only 10 schools for enrollments of students over 60. Twenty-eight schools stated that they had approximately the same enrollment in all six age groups.

[12] This figure is the actual number of schools reporting their largest enrollment within this range. No school has been counted twice.

Since only 9 schools report any considerable enrollment of students under twenty years of age, the main contribution of the schools covered by this survey is obviously in the area of adult education in foreign languages, and it is a heartening sign that the age group from 21 to 50 makes up the greater part of the enrollment.

PART VIII. CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

The types of students attending these schools are extremely varied. Five categories, college students, business people, prospective tourists, housewives, and people intending to work abroad, are apparently the most frequent types. The largest number of schools, 85, mention business people as part of their clientele; 73 schools have prospective tourists as students; 70 list housewives; 61 list college students; and 55 list people intending to work abroad.

TABLE XII. CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

Classification of Students	No. of Schools
College students	61
Business people	85
Prospective tourists	73
Housewives	70
People intending to work abroad	55
Other categories:	
Professional people	10
Grade and high school students	10
Government employees (including Armed Forces)	8
FL teachers	7
Clergy	5
Entertainers and singers	4
Nurses	3
Ph.D. candidates	2
Translators and interpreters	2
U.N. people	2
People simply interested in FL or culture of country	8
(Other categories mentioned only once: police, Federal judges, prospective Fulbright students, scientists, "society ladies.")	
Schools not answering the question	3

Other schools, though fewer in number, list additional categories of students. Ten schools have professional people as students (apparently a distinction between the professions [law, medicine] and "business people"); 10 list grade and high school students; 8 list government employees, including members of the Armed Forces; 8 list people simply interested in the foreign language or the culture of the country; 7 list FL teachers; and 5 list members of the clergy.

The great variety of categories of students shows clearly that these schools are serving a wide and fairly representative cross-section of our society, or at least of the middle class. The categories conspicuously absent are those such as factory workers and farmers.

PART IX. TEACHING STAFF

A. Per cent of native teachers: The great majority of teachers in these schools are native speakers of the language they teach. Seventy-two of the eighty-six schools which answered this question employ only native teachers. In six other schools from 75% to 95% of the staff consists of native speakers. Three schools have a staff with 50% native teachers; one has only 14% native teachers; and only four schools have no native instructors.

One might expect to find the larger proportion of schools with native teachers in the Eastern cities where there are large numbers of educated foreign speakers to draw upon, but judging from the result of this survey, this is not the case. Of the 72 schools with 100% native instructors, 41 schools are in the three Eastern cities, Boston, New York, and Washington, and 31 from the other regions of the country. This represents about the same proportion as the relation between the total number of schools in the Eastern cities, 51, and the total number in the other regions, 42. In the group of schools with 75% to 95% native instructors, only one school is in the East; the remaining 5 are in other sections of the country.

The significance of this relationship has nothing to do with the size of the schools, but it does seem to indicate a generally prevailing preference among these schools for the native speaker as instructor rather than the American-born instructor.

B. Full-time and part-time staff: It is difficult to interpret the comparison of these figures for 1955 and 1960 for two reasons. In the first place, 20 new schools have been established since 1955, and of the 73 in existence in 1955, 30 either did not answer this question or answered only part of it. Secondly, 30 out of the 93 schools in existence in 1960 either did not answer this question or gave only a partial answer.

On the basis of the figures available, it appears that there may have been no appreciable increase in full-time teachers during these five years, but that there apparently was an increase in part-time staff, even discounting the establishment of 20 new schools, most of which are fairly small. In 1955, 21 schools employed a total of 205 full-time teachers; in 1960, 38 schools reported a total of

TABLE XIII. TEACHING STAFF

Part A

Per cent of native teachers	No. of schools
0	4
14	1
50	3
75	2
80	2
90	1
95	1
100	72
Question not answered	7

Part B

Full-time and part-time staff

Full-time teachers, 1955: 205 (21 schools)
Part-time teachers, 1955. 317 (36 schools)
Schools with no full-time teachers, 1955: 21
Question not answered or only partially answered: 30 schools
Schools not yet established in 1955: 20 schools

Full-time teachers, 1960: 300 (38 schools)
Part-time teachers, 1960: 587 (51 schools)
Schools with no full-time teachers, 1960: 39
Question not answered or only partially answered: 30 schools

300 full-time teachers. In 1955, 36 schools employed 317 part-time teachers; in 1960, 51 schools reported 587 part-time teachers.

In all schools which gave figures, the number of part-time teachers is always larger than the number of full-time teachers. The reasons for this seem obvious, and were indeed mentioned by a number of informants in New York. Most schools do not have enough students in the rarer languages to justify the employment of a full-time instructor for each language, and many of the smaller schools do not need more than part-time staff to handle their small enrollments in some of the more common languages. There were 21 schools in 1955 and 40 schools in 1960 with no full-time instructors.

The geographical distribution of full- and part-time staff corresponds to the geographical distribution of student enrollment. In 1955, 192 of the 205 full-time instructors were employed in 13 schools in the three Eastern cities; the remaining 13 were employed in 4 schools in the other regions of the country. In 1960, 252 of the 300 full-time instructors were employed in 27 schools in the three Eastern cities; the remaining 48 were employed in 11 schools in the other regions of the country. The distribution is similar with part-time instructors. In 1955, 276 of the 317 part-time instructors were employed in 28 schools in the three Eastern cities; the remaining 41 were employed in 8 schools in the other regions of the country. In 1960, 529 of the 587 part-time instructors were employed in 37 schools in the three Eastern cities; the remaining 58 were employed in 14 schools in the other regions of the country.

PART X. AGE OF SCHOOLS

The oldest school of this group was established in 1852; the second in 1872; the third in 1876; and two others in 1878. Of these five oldest schools, three are in New York and Washington, one is in the Middle West, and one in the Far West. In all, eleven schools were established before 1900, all except three in New York and Washington. Between 1900 and 1930 only nine additional schools were founded, three in the East, three in the Middle West, and three in the West. The next two decades brought a considerable increase in new schools. From 1931 to 1940, 18 new schools were established, 11 in the East, one in the Middle West, and 6 in the West. From 1941 to 1950, 18 others were founded, 7 in the East, 2 in the South, 4 in the Middle West, and 5 in the West. Between 1951 and 1955 only 9 new schools were founded, 6 in the East and 3 in the Middle West. From 1956 to 1960 there was another decided increase in new schools, 20 in all, 11 in the East, 8 in the Middle West, and one in the West.

TABLE XIV. DATE WHEN SCHOOL WAS ESTABLISHED

Date	No. of schools
Before 1900	11
1900–10	2
1911–20	3
1921–30	4
1931–40	18
1941–50	18
1951–55	9
1956–60	20
No date given	8

PART XI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Most of the interviewers obtained additional information or comments on the status of FL teaching and on certain problems in the non-academic schools in the city on which they reported. These additional comments fall into two main categories.

One is the number of cities which seem to have a surprisingly small number of such schools. Various explanations were suggested, namely, that it is now possible to obtain language instruction in so many other types of institutions that there is not enough demand for more schools of the non-academic type; that many people are not willing or able to pay the high prices for language instruction when they can get it cheaper elsewhere; that the geographic location (from a city in the Middle West) decreases the demand for such schools; that large organized nationality groups offer instruction in their own language; that it is difficult to find good FL teachers. From the business schools of one city come two conflicting opinions on this subject. Few of these schools offer FL instruction, some stating that the city already has an adequate supply of bilingual secretaries, others maintaining that the demand for bilingual secretaries is far greater than the supply and that students would be available if more schools offered FL training.

The other problem most frequently mentioned was the number of schools which seem to be going to seed or are barely managing to survive. In two cities the impression of the interviewers is that the larger schools seem to be doing well on the whole, but that the smaller ones are having a hard time to make ends meet. At least two interviewers felt that many obviously small schools were reluctant to give enrollment figures simply because they were ashamed to admit how few students they have. Some reports from the Middle West and Far West were particularly pessimistic about the financial state of a number of the schools, and one interviewer prophesied the demise in the near future of some of the schools he visited if the general situation does not change. A number of schools stated that they supplement their income by selling records and textbooks, and some combine teaching with translating.